



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

any author. Such critics will delight in Merrill's list. So numerous are the letters in place of which any given letter is found in the MSS that apparent support can be discovered for almost any conjecture. For example, *i* is found for *a*, *ai*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *em*, *et*, *f*, *h*, *l*, *mu*, *o*, *or*, *p*, *q*, *r*, *ru*, *s*, *st*, *t*, *te*, *u*, *um*, *umst*, *y*, *yc*, not to mention the combinations of *i* with other letters, as *ia* for *e*, etc. Professor Merrill would do us a real service if he would classify his examples so that misuse of his list would be impossible. In such a classification many elements would need to be considered—frequency of occurrence, numerous psychological factors, abbreviations, etc.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

---

*The Roman Elegiac Poets.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON. New York: American Book Co., 1914. Pp. 444.

An adequate edition of selections from Roman elegy for use with college classes has been a pressing need for many years. It is a great satisfaction to find that Professor Harrington's book satisfies that need to the full. It is well adapted to the class of students—advanced undergraduates—for which it was prepared. Not being intended, on the one hand, for Freshmen, there can be no objection to such features as notes on the same page as the text, numerous cross-references and references to other authors—Greek and Latin—the inclusion of a brief critical apparatus, the fulness of the book; not being intended, on the other hand, specifically for graduate students, we need not look for exhaustive treatment—which a book of selections in the nature of the case precludes.

The selection is full enough to suit all—so full that few will look in vain for their favorite poems. The inclusion of some of the poems of Catullus which are in the elegiac meter is certainly logical, but practical considerations hardly make it a necessity, for most students read some of the elegiac poems in a regular course in Catullus, since it is not feasible to split up the poems according to genre. We can, to be sure, read the short lyrics along with Horace, but what are we to do with poem 64? It is true that the inclusion of Catullus' elegies in this book can do no harm, and probably it was better to include than to omit them.

The editor has examined a number of MSS of the authors included in the volume (Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid) and has applied independent judgment to the careful working over of the texts. Hence the texts are particularly commendable and are far more satisfactory than one has a right to expect in a book of selections. For Catullus, a number of readings are given from Professor Hale's unpublished collation of R. A selected critical apparatus is given below the text. It does not seem to be formed on any particular principle—except that of extreme brevity. My

feeling is that in all cases where the text differs from the consensus of the best MSS the MS reading should be given in the apparatus, or better still, in a book of selections the apparatus should be omitted entirely. Why, for example, should there be no note on the text reading *anne* in Cat. 66. 15, where the MSS and some editions have *atque*, while on the reading *te* in Cat. 66. 25 it is noted that *te* is omitted in V and is an emendation of Avanti-  
 tius, though it is clear from the meter that there is something wrong with the MS reading? Still more striking is the absence of a note in Prop. i. 8. 27, where Harrington prints *erit*, though N A F (whose agreement makes it certain that other readings are emendations) have *erat*, not to mention the fact that *erat* is far more appropriate. I realize of course and sympathize with the editor's dilemma: after having put a great deal of labor on textual matters, he naturally wanted to justify his text by means of an apparatus, but felt bound to keep it as small as possible.

The introduction is, altogether, an admirable piece of work. It contains all the information it should, and is concise and lucid. These qualities are evidently the result of long and careful work, and the whole book indeed shows that much time and labor have been devoted to it. In less than fifty pages we have a history of the genus elegy, separate chapters on the authors included, and a discussion of meter. The chapters on the authors deal with biography, characterization, MSS, and editions. The numerous articles quoted have been carefully digested. Occasionally the need of conciseness makes the editor dogmatic, as in his statement that "the Glycera mentioned by Horace (*Carm.* i. 33) as faithless to Albius may be set down as another flame of Tibullus, as she cannot be identified with either Delia or Nemesis." For the same reason a rival theory is sometimes given rather scant justice, as in the chronology of the Messalla campaigns, though here references are given to enable the reader to judge for himself. It is stated that the *Ambrosianus* of Tibullus was written in 1374, for which there is no evidence, though it is certain that it was written about that time. And it is an unnecessary insult to this our best MS of Tibullus to say that it is *comparatively* free from interpolations. Baehrens' dates for V and G, which Harrington quotes, can be definitely rejected. V belongs to the fifteenth century and G was written about 1460. In stating that "quite a case can be made out for thinking that Horace turned up his nose at the poetic aspirations as well as the personality of" Propertius, Harrington, it seems to me, is overstating the case. In discussing the book-division of Propertius, the editor, like many other scholars, directs his attention to Lachmann's weak arguments for a division into five books, not realizing that Birt has put the theory on an entirely different and much firmer basis.

While the text and notes as a whole are admirable, there are naturally enough criticisms in detail. Cat. 65. 9 is printed, without brackets or other special indication, as part of the text, though it is found only in fifteenth-century MSS and was certainly not written by Catullus. On Cat. 66. 48-50

one misses a reference to the *εἰπετής* as an Alexandrian favorite and to the many similar expressions in the later elegy. In 66. 53 Bentley's *nictantibus* (*alis*) is preferred by Harrington to *nulantibus* of the MSS and is defended by the note, "the imagery has a rare charm." Tastes differ: to me it seems absurd to speak of winking wings. In Tib. i. 3. 33 *contingat* is said to depend on *ut* of vs. 29; with this I cannot agree. In vs. 36 *vias* is called an accusative of purpose, which seems improbable, as does the same classification in i. 10. 6, *in . . . . feras*. In Tib. ii. 173 the phrase "the perfect tenses express customary action" is an unfortunate one, as it confuses the gnomic perfect with the imperfect of repeated or customary action. There might have been a note on the meaning of ii. 5. 31, on the use of *aeternum* (neuter for feminine) in vs. 64, and on the interpretation of the difficult passage beginning with vs. 70. The statement in the introduction to Tib. iv. 2 is ambiguous, to say the least, for it gives the impression that January was not in any sense the first month of the year until 46 B.C., which is, of course, not true. In the notes to Tib. iv. 13 there should be a reference to Smith's edition, which, it may be stated here, is little quoted, evidently having appeared too late to be of much service.

Similar details might be singled out for comment in other parts of the book, but they would merely show that opinions differ or that occasionally the editor was human enough to err. On the whole the book is an excellent and conscientious (perhaps too conscientious, if that is possible) piece of work. As for the mechanical side, cover and typography make a pleasing impression on the eye, and misprints seem to have been relentlessly ferreted out.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH